



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,759	12/21/2001	James A. Brady	9386.17711-D	4473

7590

12/23/2003

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.
Post Office Box 26618
Milwaukee, WI 53226-0618

EXAMINER

BIANCO, PATRICIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3762

10

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/036,759	Applicant(s) BRADY ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia M Bianco	Art Unit 3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 62-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-15, 62-65 and 67-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 66 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/21/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5, 5, 7, 8. 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group A, claims 1-15 & 62-76, in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Response to Amendment

Applicant has cancelled claims 16-61 & 72-92, which were directed to non-elected inventions.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference number "68" has been used to designate two distinct parts of figure 11. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Reference number **66** mentioned on page 38, line 6 is not in the figures. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant has indicated co-pending applications in the first paragraph of the specification. The first page of the specification should be updated to clarify the **status** of all related applications noted in the first paragraph of the specification. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plus-function language to define Applicant's invention. Therefore the Examiner requires the Applicant to amend the specification pursuant to 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP 608.01(o) to explicitly

Art Unit: 3762

state, with reference to the terms and phrases of the claim element, what structure, materials, and acts perform the function recited in the claim element. Please note that the MPEP clearly states, "Even if the disclosure implicitly sets forth the structure, materials, or acts corresponding to the means-(or step-) plus-function claim element in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, the PTO may still require the applicant to amend the specification pursuant to 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP 608.01(o)...". (Also see **MPEP 2181** (Rev. 1, Feb.2000)) *Wolfensperger*, 302 F.2d at 955, 133 USPQ at 542. Appropriate correction is required.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims **1-8 and 62-69** are **objected** to because of the following informalities: It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plus-function language to define Applicant's invention. Therefore the Examiner has objected to the claims for the reasons set forth above in the objection to the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application

by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 11-15, 62, 64, 65, 67-69 & 72-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davankov et al. (5,773,384). Davankov discloses a system for extracorporeally removing toxins, such as cytokines from blood using an adsorbent material held in a housing. Blood is withdrawn from a blood vessel (inherently using a catheter inserted into the vessel) and passed through a column holding the adsorbent material within a housing or cartridge. The adsorbent is a biocompatible, polymeric material such as polystyrene resin, copolymers of methacryloyloxethyle or styrene-divinylbenzene copolymers. The cartridge has an inlet and an outlet that is designed to be easily connected with the blood circuit. (Col. 5, line 8-col. 8, line 30). With respect to claims 12-15 and 73-76, the claim limitations are considered to be a product-by-process recitation and do not constitute a positive recitation of further structure for the system. "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product

Art Unit: 3762

was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). The claim limitations have been met since Davankov discloses a polymer material chosen from copolymers of styrene and divinylbenzene (an aromatic compound) for the material used.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims **2, 9, 10, 63, 70 & 71** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davankov et al. ('384). Davankov discloses the invention substantially as claimed, see rejection supra, however, fails to disclose specifically that the system includes a means for administering an agent to the individual to treat their

Art Unit: 3762

condition and that the material has a Biocompatibility Index of not greater than 14. With respect to claims 2 & 63, it is the position of the examiner that it is well known in the art that, as part of an extracorporeal system, tubing or lines with ports are included to be used for delivery of drugs or fluids, which may be used as a means for administering an agent to the individual if needed. With respect to claims 9, 10, 70 & 71, it is the position of the examiner that a material having such a Biocompatibility Index would have been obvious since Davankov teaches that the adsorbent material used is a biocompatible polymeric material. Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Davankov to have an adsorbent material that has a Biocompatibility Index that is specifically not greater than 14, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims **5 & 66 are objected to** as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matter that could either not be found or was not suggested in the prior art of record was the tubing having a wall impregnated with the material for removing cytokines or other species of pro-inflammatory or anti-inflammatory stimulators or mediators from the blood in combination with the other elements (or steps) in the claims.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia M Bianco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1482. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00-6:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0873.

December 22nd, 2003


Patricia M Bianco
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3762